



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,913	09/14/2006	Jurgen Adams	78857.105106	1985
86528	7590	03/30/2010		
King & Spalding LLP 401 Congress Avenue Suite 3200 Austin, TX 78701			EXAMINER GUILLERMET, FRED	
			ART UNIT 2625	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 03/30/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

AustinUSPTO@kslaw.com  
AustinIP@kslaw.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/598,913	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ADAMS, JURGEN	
	<b>Examiner</b> Fred Guillermetty	<b>Art Unit</b> 2625	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 September 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Examiner Notes**

- 1.** The Examiner cites particular columns, line numbers, and/or paragraphs in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, Applicant fully consider the references in their entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.
- 2.** In view of the aforementioned, it is respectfully requested that Applicant reciprocate the courtesies extended by the Examiner and cite specific support from the specification when amending claims. The Examiner appreciates Applicant's good faith and diligence in this matter.

### **Specification**

- 3.** The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
- 4.** The specification is objected to for minor informalities. There appears to be inconsistencies in how elements are numbered in at least paragraph [0020] of Applicant's filed specification. Element 34 is listed as both the "printing unit driver" and the "conveying unit drive". Element 35 is listed as both the "printer motor driver" and "paper sensor interface". Clarification is respectfully requested.

### **Drawings**

- 5.** The drawings are objected to because the unlabeled rectangular boxes shown in the **Fig. 3** should be provided with descriptive text labels. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should

Art Unit: 2625

include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### **Claim Objections**

**6.** **Claim 13** is objected to for minor informalities. The grammar of the instant claim nearly renders it indecipherable. Applicant is respectfully requested to review the claim language and put it into proper grammatical and idiomatic English.

**7.** **Claims 8 and 14** are objected to for minor informalities. The instant claims recite the limitation “the additional configuration”. Antecedent basis is lacking for this limitation. The limitation is believed to be “the configuration”. Clarification is respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

**8.** The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States, or

**9.** **Claims 1, 3, 6, and 9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 4,644,368 (“Mutz”).

**With respect to claim 1**, Mutz discloses an arrangement having a printer comprising a printing unit (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least printing driver 27*) for printing a print medium (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least print carrier 3*), wherein the printer is a constituent part of a digital tachograph in a motor vehicle (*col. 1, lines 12-15 – see at least tachograph and microprocessor*), the print medium has a format and configuration (*col. 5, lines 14-34 – see at least rectangular print carrier 3, field 37, heading section 38, wide table sections 39 and 40, table section 41, and free space below; Fig. 4*), and the printing unit outputs a specific content of a printout onto the print medium as a function of a design of the print medium configuration (*see Fig. 4*).

**With respect to claim 3**, Mutz discloses the arrangement according to claim 1, wherein the printing unit is connected to a control unit (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least microprocessor 23*), by means of which the printing operation can be controlled, and the control unit assigns the specific content of the output which the printing unit outputs onto the print medium to the print medium configuration (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – the microprocessor controls operations of the device including what to print; see at least Fig. 4*).

**With respect to claim 6**, Mutz discloses a method for printing a print medium (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least print carrier 3*) by means of a printer (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least printing driver 27*) of a digital tachograph in a motor vehicle (*col. 1, lines 12-15 – see at least tachograph and microprocessor*), comprising the steps of:

- printing a print medium, wherein the print medium having a format and a configuration (*col. 5, lines 14-34 – see at least rectangular print carrier 3, field 37, heading section 38, wide table sections 39 and 40, table section 41, and free space below; Fig. 4*), and wherein a printing unit outputs a specific content of a printout onto the print medium as a function of the design of the print medium configuration (*see Fig. 4*).

**With respect to claim 9**, Mutz discloses the method according to claim 6, wherein the printer has an insertion opening into which the print medium can be inserted for printing (*col. 3, line 54 to col. 4, line 12 – see at least front feed slot 2*).

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

**10.** The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**11.** **Claims 2, 8, and 13-15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,644,368 ("Mutz") in view of US 6,633,393 ("Fukano").

**With respect to claim 2,** Mutz discloses the arrangement according to claim 1.

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose wherein the printer has at least one sensor detecting the print medium configuration, the sensor reports the design of the print medium configuration to a control unit, and the control unit assigns the design of the print medium configuration to a specific content of the printout, which the printing unit prints onto the print medium.

However, Mutz does disclose that the printer has a sensor to detect the presence of the print medium (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least switch 29*) and that this information is sent to a control unit (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least microprocessor 23*). While the exemplary embodiment disclosed by Mutz presumably uses a print medium with the same layout each time and only on one side, it is readily apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art that a more versatile print system is envisioned without departing from the spirit and scope of Mutz's disclosure (*col. 11, lines 6-9*). Consider the teachings of Fukano. Fukano discloses a print system for printing to both sides of cut-sheet forms and other print media (*col. 1, lines 8-14*). Fukano further discloses that that print system has at least one sensor (*col. 12, lines 30-38 – see at least detector (A)*) detecting the print medium configuration (*see at least Fig. 12*), the sensor reports the design of the print medium configuration (*see at least Fig. 12*) to a control unit (*see at least controller 204 of Fig. 10*) and that the printing system prints accordingly based on the sensor's

Art Unit: 2625

results (*col. 11, lines 30-55 – see at least steps S1109 and S1110*). Such an arrangement advantageously improves throughput and efficiency and allows desirable print results to be achieved without wasting printing forms as a result of printing to the wrong side (*col. 14, lines 35-42*).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the teachings of Fukano, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously improved throughput and efficiency and achieved desirable printing results without wasting printing forms.

**With respect to claim 8**, Mutz discloses the method according to claim 6.

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose wherein a sensor detects the additional configuration and reports it to the control unit, which assigns the content of the printout to the printing operation as a function of the print medium configuration and controls the printing unit accordingly.

However, Mutz does disclose that the printer has a sensor to detect the presence of the print medium (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least switch 29*) and that this information is sent to a control unit (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least microprocessor 23*). While the exemplary embodiment disclosed by Mutz presumably uses a print medium with the same layout each time and only on one side, it is readily apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art that a more versatile print system is envisioned without departing from the spirit and scope of Mutz's disclosure (*col. 11, lines 6-9*). Consider the teachings of Fukano. Fukano discloses a print system for printing to both sides of cut-sheet forms and other print media (*col. 1, lines 8-14*). Fukano further discloses that that print system has at least one sensor (*col. 12, lines 30-38 – see at least detector (A)*) detecting the print medium configuration (*see at least Fig. 12*), the sensor reports the design of the print medium configuration (*see at least Fig. 12*) to a control unit (*see at least controller 204 of Fig. 10*) and that the printing system prints accordingly based on the sensor's results (*col. 11, lines 30-55 – see at least steps S1109 and S1110*). Such an arrangement advantageously improves throughput and efficiency and allows desirable print results to be achieved without wasting printing forms as a result of printing to the wrong side (*col. 14, lines 35-42*).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the teachings of Fukano, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously improved throughput and efficiency and achieved desirable printing results without wasting printing forms.

**With respect to claim 13**, Mutz discloses a print medium (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least print carrier 3*), wherein the print medium designed for a digital tachograph in a motor vehicle (*col. 1, lines 12-15 – see at least tachograph and microprocessor*) and, comprising a predefined format and configuration (*col. 5, lines 14-34 – see at least rectangular print carrier 3, field 37, heading section 38, wide table sections 39 and 40, table section 41, and free space below; Fig. 4*), [...], and wherein a printing unit of the printer outputting a specific content of the printout onto the print medium as a function of its design *see Fig. 4*).

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose wherein the design of the configuration can be detected by a printer.

However, Mutz does disclose that the printer has a sensor to detect the presence of the print medium (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least switch 29*) and that this information is sent to a control unit (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least microprocessor 23*). While the exemplary embodiment disclosed by Mutz presumably uses a print medium with the same layout each time and only on one side, it is readily apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art that a more versatile print system is envisioned without departing from the spirit and scope of Mutz's disclosure (*col. 11, lines 6-9*). Consider the teachings of Fukano. Fukano discloses a print system for printing to both sides of cut-sheet forms and other print media (*col. 1, lines 8-14*). Fukano further discloses that that print system has at least one sensor (*col. 12, lines 30-38 – see at least detector (A)*) detecting the print medium configuration (*see at least Fig. 12*), the sensor reports the design of the print medium configuration (*see at least Fig. 12*) to a control unit (*see at least controller 204 of Fig. 10*) and that the printing system prints accordingly based on the sensor's results (*col. 11, lines 30-55 – see at least steps S1109 and S1110*). Such an arrangement advantageously improves throughput and efficiency and allows desirable



Art Unit: 2625

print results to be achieved without wasting printing forms as a result of printing to the wrong side (*col. 14, lines 35-42*).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the teachings of Fukano, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously improved throughput and efficiency and achieved desirable printing results without wasting printing forms.

**With respect to claim 14**, Mutz discloses the print medium according to claim 13.

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose wherein the additional configuration is defined by a color, an edge contour or a marking.

However, Mutz does disclose that the printer has a sensor to detect the presence of the print medium (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least switch 29*) and that this information is sent to a control unit (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least microprocessor 23*). While the exemplary embodiment disclosed by Mutz presumably uses a print medium with the same layout each time and only on one side, it is readily apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art that a more versatile print system is envisioned without departing from the spirit and scope of Mutz's disclosure (*col. 11, lines 6-9*). Consider the teachings of Fukano. Fukano discloses a print system for printing to both sides of cut-sheet forms and other print media (*col. 1, lines 8-14*). Fukano further discloses that that print system has at least one sensor (*col. 12, lines 30-38 – see at least detector (A)*) detecting the print medium configuration (*see at least Fig. 12*), the sensor reports the design of the print medium configuration (*see at least Fig. 12*) to a control unit (*see at least controller 204 of Fig. 10*) and that the printing system prints accordingly based on the sensor's results (*col. 11, lines 30-55 – see at least steps S1109 and S1110*). Such an arrangement advantageously improves throughput and efficiency and allows desirable print results to be achieved without wasting printing forms as a result of printing to the wrong side (*col. 14, lines 35-42*).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the teachings of Fukano, since doing so

Art Unit: 2625

would have predictably and advantageously improved throughput and efficiency and achieved desirable printing results without wasting printing forms.

**With respect to claim 15**, Mutz discloses the print medium according to claim 13, wherein the print medium is a paper strip (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least print carrier 3*).

**12. Claims 4, 5, 7, 10, and 12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,644,368 (“Mutz”) in view of US 2001/0045452 (“Momose”).

**With respect to claim 4**, Mutz discloses the arrangement according to claim 1.

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose wherein the printer has an insertion opening and a conveying drive which can be operated bidirectionally for conveying the print medium and which is activated in such a way that it begins with the conveyance in a threading direction when the print medium is put in.

However, it is well known in the art to convey a print medium bidirectionally and to begin conveyance when the print medium is put in. This is evidenced by at least Momose. Momose discloses a conveyance drive (*paragraph [0107] - see at least cut-sheet form loading rollers 23 and transportation rollers 29*) that conveys a print medium bidirectionally (*paragraph [0103] – the print medium can be transported in forward and reverse directions*) and does so when the paper medium is inserted (*paragraph [0167] – see at least paper detector 24*). This advantageously eliminates the need for a print head to move along the length of the print medium and allows the same insertion slot to also be used as an ejection slot.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant’s invention to have combined the teachings of Momose, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously eliminated the need for a print head to move along the length of a print medium and allowed the same insertion slot to also be used as an ejection slot.

**With respect to claim 5**, Mutz discloses the arrangement according to claim 4.

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose wherein the printing unit prints the print medium as it is conveyed in the threading direction or as it is conveyed in an output direction.

However, it is well known in the art to convey a print medium bidirectionally and to begin conveyance when the print medium is put in. This is evidenced by at least Momose. Momose discloses a conveyance drive (*paragraph [0107] - see at least cut-sheet form loading rollers 23 and transportation rollers 29*) that conveys a print medium bidirectionally (*paragraph [0103] – the print medium can be transported in forward and reverse directions*) and does so when the paper medium is inserter (*paragraph [0167] – see at least paper detector 24*). This advantageously eliminates the need for a print head to move along the length of the print medium and allows the same insertion slot to also be used as an ejection slot.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the teachings of Momose, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously eliminated the need for a print head to move along the length of a print medium and allowed the same insertion slot to also be used as an ejection slot.

**With respect to claim 7**, Mutz discloses the method according to claim 5, wherein the printing unit is controlled by means of a control unit (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – the microprocessor controls operations of the device including what to print; see at least Fig. 4*).

**With respect to claim 10**, Mutz discloses the method according to claim 9.

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose wherein the printer has a conveying device, by means of which the print medium is drawn in and output after being inserted into the insertion opening.

However, it is well known in the art to convey a print medium bidirectionally and to begin conveyance when the print medium is put in. This is evidenced by at least Momose. Momose discloses a conveyance drive (*paragraph [0107] - see at least cut-sheet form loading rollers 23 and transportation rollers 29*) that conveys a print medium bidirectionally (*paragraph [0103] – the print medium can be transported in forward and reverse directions*) and does so when the paper medium is inserter (*paragraph [0167] – see at least paper detector 24*). This advantageously eliminates the need for a print

Art Unit: 2625

head to move along the length of the print medium and allows the same insertion slot to also be used as an ejection slot.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the teachings of Momose, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously eliminated the need for a print head to move along the length of a print medium and allowed the same insertion slot to also be used as an ejection slot.

**With respect to claim 12**, Mutz discloses the method according to claim 6.

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose wherein the print medium is fed to the printer in sections, and the feeding of each section initiates a conveying and printing operation, and the output of the printed section concludes the one conveying and printing operation.

However, it is well known in the art to convey a print medium bidirectionally and to begin conveyance when the print medium is put in. This is evidenced by at least Momose. Momose discloses a conveyance drive (*paragraph [0107] - see at least cut-sheet form loading rollers 23 and transportation rollers 29*) that conveys a print medium bidirectionally (*paragraph [0103] – the print medium can be transported in forward and reverse directions*) and does so when the paper medium is inserted (*paragraph [0167] – see at least paper detector 24*). This advantageously eliminates the need for a print head to move along the length of the print medium and allows the same insertion slot to also be used as an ejection slot.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the teachings of Momose, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously eliminated the need for a print head to move along the length of a print medium and allowed the same insertion slot to also be used as an ejection slot.

**13. Claim 11** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,644,368 ("Mutz") in view of US 6,633,393 ("Fukano") and US 2001/0045452 ("Momose").

**With respect to claim 11**, Mutz discloses the method according to claim 8.

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose wherein the printer is in a rest state and the insertion of the print medium transfers it into an operating state.

However, it is well known in the art to convey a print medium bidirectionally and to begin conveyance when the print medium is put in. This is evidenced by at least Momose. Momose discloses a conveyance drive (*paragraph [0107] - see at least cut-sheet form loading rollers 23 and transportation rollers 29*) that conveys a print medium bidirectionally (*paragraph [0103] – the print medium can be transported in forward and reverse directions*) and does so when the paper medium is inserted (*paragraph [0167] – see at least paper detector 24*). This advantageously eliminates the need for a print head to move along the length of the print medium and allows the same insertion slot to also be used as an ejection slot.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the teachings of Momose, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously eliminated the need for a print head to move along the length of a print medium and allowed the same insertion slot to also be used as an ejection slot.

**14. Claim 16** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,644,368 ("Mutz") in view of US 6,633,393 ("Fukano") and further in view of US 6,392,677 ("Lais").

**With respect to claim 16**, Mutz discloses the print medium according to claim 13.

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose wherein the paper strip has at least one fold.

However, it is well known in the art that continuous feed paper is desirable for a tachograph. This is evidenced by at least Lais (*col. 1, lines 4-11*). Furthermore, it is well known in the art that paper on a roll isn't the only type of continuous feed paper available. It is well known in the art that continuous feed paper can be folded along

Art Unit: 2625

perforations. This allows the paper to advantageously be stored in a box shape as opposed to a cylinder.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have used continuous paper such as continuous feed paper with folder perforations, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously allowed paper to be stored in a box shape as opposed to a cylinder.

**15. Claims 17 and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,644,368 ("Mutz") in view of US 6,633,393 ("Fukano") and further in view of WO 2004/017264 using US 2005/0134673 ("Bendek") as a translation.

**With respect to claim 17**, Mutz discloses the print medium according to claim 13.

Mutz fails explicitly disclose wherein the print medium is provided with a human-readable marking or symbols identifying the assignment of the print content.

Bendek, working in the same field of endeavor, discloses having human readable markings on the back of the print medium that can be used for manual recordings (*paragraph [0006]*). This advantageously allows for manual recordings in the event of a tachograph malfunction.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the teachings of Bendek, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously allowed for manual recordings in the event of a tachograph malfunction.

**With respect to claim 18**, Mutz discloses the print medium according to claim 13.

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose wherein the print medium is provided with an original layout, so that the printout and the original layout supplement each other.

Bendek, working in the same field of endeavor, discloses a nearly invisible text, constituting a layout, that supplements the printout (*paragraph [0014], [0028], Fig. 2*). This advantageously allows for storing further references without interfering with statutory requirements (*paragraph [0014] and [0028]*).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the teachings of Bendek, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously allowed for storing further references without interfering with statutory requirements.

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fred Guillermetty whose telephone number is (571)270-5081. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs, 8:00AM - 5:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler L. Haskins can be reached on (571) 272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Fred Guillermetty/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Twyler L. Haskins/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625